

In The United States Patent And Trademark Office

Applicant:	Vesa Ahvenniemi et al.	Date:	February 21, 2008
Date Filed:	Feb. 9, 2005	Docket No.:	METSO-32
App. No.:	10/524,092	Art Unit:	1731
For:	Method and Device for Threading a Web in the Reeling of a Paper or Board Web	Examiner:	E. Hug

Filed by Electronic Filing System

Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In the Office Action dated June 27, 2007, the examiner found allowable subject matter in claims 20, 21 and 27-33 for the reasons stated therein, which reasoning was **not** based on the finding present in the final Statement of Reasons for Allowance that “*the prior art does not disclose or suggest a suction reeling drum wherein the drum interior is connected to a source of a lower static pressure outside the reeling drum*”.

Claim 20 would be allowable for further reciting the spacing of the apertures in the circumferential and transverse direction. (Office Action dated June 27, 2007, page 5, lines 12-13)

Claim 21 would be allowable for further reciting the diameter of the apertures and their spacing in the circumferential direction. (Office Action dated June 27, 2007, page 5, lines 14-15)

Claims 27-33 would be allowable for reciting the diameter of the apertures and speed at which the air is drawn through the apertures. (Office Action dated June 27, 2007, page 5, lines 16-17)

In applicant's response filed an August 29, 2007, applicant argued that claim 18 as amended and the claim dependent therefrom, distinguished over Madrzak et al. (US 5,915,648) by the claimed arrangement whereby the drum interior is connected to a source of

Applicant: Vesa Ahvenniemi et al.
Application No.: 10/524,092
Art Unit: 1731

a lower static pressure outside the reeling drum, but did not argue *a source of a lower static pressure outside the reeling drum* was not shown in the art of record. See for example: with respect to a reeling drum, in particular see FI 74446 FIG. 3, and with respect to a roll in general, see 5,135,614; 5,873,180.

As stated in paragraph [0003] of the specification “In known arrangements in which the suction zone is formed into a sector, it is hardly at all possible to remove the boundary layer air flow produced by the rotating drum.” Claim 18 addresses the stated problem and distinguishes over the art of record by the combination:


“a suction zone which extends around the entire circumference of the reeling drum”

“the suction zone forms a part of the portions of the cylindrical surface forming the area where a full-width web is arranged to run during reeling”

“the suction zone forms a part of the portions of the cylindrical surface forming the area where a full-width web is arranged to run during reeling” in combination with

“wherein the drum interior is connected to the source of a lower static pressure outside the reeling drum” in the context of the other limitations of the claim.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870

February 21, 2008 (1:23pm)